

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action dated January 23, 2008. Claims 1-47 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-47 have been rejected. Claims 40 and 46 have been amended to further define the scope and novelty of the present invention, as well as to correct typographical and grammatical errors, in view of the Examiner's comments, in order to place the claims in condition for allowance. Support for the amendments to the claims is found in previously presented claims 41-45 and in Figure 6, element 140. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been presented. Claims 1-39, 41-45, and 47 have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 40 and 46 remain pending. Also, the Title and Abstract have been amended to reflect the cancellations to the claims. For the reasons set forth more fully below, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are allowable. Consequently, reconsideration, allowance, and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the after-final phone interview of March 14, 2008. We appreciate the courtesy and helpfulness of the Examiner in the interview. The claims have been amended in light of the points made by the Examiner in the interview.

Applicants do not concede in this application that the claims as previously presented are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the remaining claims. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications. Nevertheless,

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

Drawings

Examiner Stated:

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “a spring coupled to the frame and the bearing” in claims 1, 10, 20, 32 and 40 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered...

In response, Figure 6 has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion during the after-final phone interview of March 14, 2008 to address the above-referenced objections. Specifically, Figure 6 has been amended to extend the spring 160 to attach to the bearing 140. The corrected drawings are attached hereto.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Examiner Stated:

Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 15, 16, 20, 21, 26, 27, 32, 35-37, 40, 41, 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miki (US Patent 6,585,253)...

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections. The present invention provides a method for feeding a document through a printer. The method includes providing at least one cantilevered roller shaft in the printer for advancing the document, where the at least one cantilevered roller shaft comprises a distal end and a proximal end. The method also includes coupling only the proximal end to a frame of the printer such that the distal end floats. The method also includes coupling a bearing to the at least one cantilevered roller shaft, wherein the bearing is a cylinder having a same axis

as the at least one cantilevered roller shaft, wherein a portion of the cylinder is raised away from the axis, wherein the raised portion comprises a surface that contacts a drive roller shaft. The method also includes coupling a spring to the frame and to the bearing such that the at least one cantilevered roller shaft is spring loaded against the drive roller shaft. Miki does not teach or suggest these features, as discussed below.

Miki discloses a feeder with a vibrating separating device, specifically, a paper feeder for use in an image forming apparatus. The paper feeder applies vibration to paper sheets being paid out together to thereby reduce an adhering force acting between them. The paper feeder therefore reduces the simultaneous feed of two or more papers to a noticeable degree. An image forming apparatus including the paper feeder is also disclosed. (Abstract.)

Applicants respectfully submit that Miki does not teach or suggest “coupling a bearing to the at least one cantilevered roller shaft, wherein the bearing is a cylinder having a same axis as the at least one cantilevered roller shaft, wherein a portion of the cylinder is raised away from the axis, wherein the raised portion comprises a surface that contacts a drive roller shaft,” as recited in amended independent claim 40. As discussed with the Examiner during the after-final phone interview of March 14, 2008, Miki fails to teach or suggest this feature. Referring to Figure 14 of Miki, the bearing 1B does not have “a portion of the cylinder is raised away from the axis, wherein the raised portion comprises a surface that contacts a drive roller shaft,” as recited in amended independent claim 40.

Therefore, Miki does not teach or suggest the combination of steps as recited in amended independent claim 40, and this claim is allowable over Miki.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Examiner Stated:

Claims 33, 34, 38, 41, 42, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miki (US Patent 6,585,253) in view of Antinora (US 7,307,741)...

Claims 1-5, 9-15, 18-26, 29-32, 35-37, 40, 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miciukiewicz (US Patent 4,763,575) in view of Miki (US Patent 6,585,253)...

Claims 33, 34, 38, 39, 41, 42, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miciukiewicz (US Patent 4,763,575) in view of Miki (US Patent 6,585,253) as applied to claims 32, 40 and 43 above, and further in view of Antinora (US 7,307,741) ...

Claims 1-32, 35-37, 40, and 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guaraldi (US 6,122,978) in view of Miki (US Patent 6,585,253)...

Claims 33, 34, 38, 39, 41, 42, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guaraldi (US 6,122,978) in view of Miki (US Patent 6,585,253) as applied to claims 32, 40 and 43 above, and further in view of Antinora (US 7,307,741) ...

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections. As noted above, claims 1-39, 41-45, and 47 have been canceled. The Examiner rejected claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miciukiewicz in view of Miki, and under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guaraldi in view of Miki. The Examiner did not rely on Miciukiewicz or Guaraldi to teach the bearing as recited in the present invention. Applicants agree with the Examiner that neither Miciukiewicz nor Guaraldi teach the spring coupled to the bearing as recited in amended independent claim 40. As noted above, Miki does not teach or suggest "coupling a bearing to the at least one cantilevered roller shaft, wherein the bearing is a cylinder having a same axis as the at least one cantilevered roller shaft, wherein a portion of the cylinder is raised away from the axis, wherein the raised portion comprises a surface that contacts a drive roller shaft," as recited in amended independent claim 40.

Therefore, Miciukiewicz in view of Miki and Guaraldi in view of Miki do not teach or suggest the combination of steps as recited in amended independent claim 40, and this claim is allowable over Miciukiewicz in view of Miki, and allowable over Guaraldi in view of Miki.

Dependent claim 46

Dependent claim 46 depends from amended independent claim 40. Accordingly, the above-articulated arguments related to independent claim 40 apply with equal force to claim 46, which is thus allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 40.

CONCLUSION

Applicants' attorney believes this application is in condition for allowance.

Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

April 1, 2008

/Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr./
Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.
Reg. No. 30,801

Customer Number 47052

(650) 493-4540

(650) 493-4549